

in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on that date with the text of the Kili/Bikini/Ejit Local Government Council's May 12, 1999 Resolution on June 29, 1999 H.R. 2368 would:

Authorize a one-time 3% distribution from the Resettlement Trust Fund for relocation and resettlement assistance primarily for the remaining senior citizens of Bikini Atoll [3% of \$126 million or \$3.7 million]; not require an appropriation of any funds by the U.S. Congress; not diminish the original corpus of the Resettlement Trust Fund [\$110 million]; provide relocation assistance now to the surviving 90 members of Bikini who were removed from their home island, as it may still take years to complete radiological restoration of the atoll to permit safe habitation; and respond to the resolution of the Bikini Council requesting this legislative action by Congress.

The Bikinians, for their part, have ensured the fiscal integrity of the Resettlement Trust Fund. They have selected reputable U.S. banks as trustees, hired well-respected and talented investment advisors and money managers, and provided for routine monthly financial statements and annual audits. Due to the Bikini Council's voluntary restraint on the use of these funds, and the success of the fund managers, the corpus remains intact, the trust fund has earned almost 14% annually, every dollar has been accounted for, annual audits are prepared, and monthly financial statements are sent to the Interior Department.

In light of the strength of the trust, its fiscal integrity, the lengthy time a cleanup and restoration will take, and the special circumstances of the elders, the Bikinians wish to make a one-time 3% distribution from the Resettlement Trust Fund, with the understanding that the primary beneficiaries of the distribution will be the 90 surviving Bikini elders. Because of the excellent management of the trust fund, such a distribution will not require an appropriation of funds by Congress, nor will it diminish the original corpus of the trust.

The authorization in H.R. 2368 for the people of Bikini is appropriate and consistent with the desires of the community of Bikini and congressional intent for the resettlement of the people whose lives and homes were disrupted by U.S. testing. This measure assists some of the people of the former Trust Territory community administered by the United States, who we still maintain relations through a Compact of Free Association. Without any additional cost to the U.S. taxpayer, Congress can be responsive to the remaining senior Bikini elders' resettlement and relocation efforts.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. I urge an "aye" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2368.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## SPANISH PEAKS WILDERNESS ACT OF 1999

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 898) designating certain land in the San Isabel National Forest in the State of Colorado as the "Spanish Peaks Wilderness."

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 898

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Spanish Peaks Wilderness Act of 1999".

### SEC. 2. DESIGNATION OF SPANISH PEAKS WILDERNESS.

(a) COLORADO WILDERNESS ACT.—Section 2(a) of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (Public Law 103-77; 107 Stat. 756; 16 U.S.C. 1132 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(20) SPANISH PEAKS WILDERNESS.—Certain land in the San Isabel National Forest that—

"(A) comprises approximately 18,000 acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled 'Proposed Spanish Peaks Wilderness', dated February 10, 1999; and

"(B) shall be known as the 'Spanish Peaks Wilderness'."

(b) MAP; BOUNDARY DESCRIPTION.—

(1) FILING.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture (referred to in this Act as the "Secretary"), shall file a map and boundary description of the area designated under subsection (a) with—

(A) the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate.

(2) FORCE AND EFFECT.—The map and boundary description under paragraph (1) shall have the same force and effect as if included in the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (Public Law 103-77; 107 Stat. 756), except that the Secretary may correct clerical and typographical errors in the map and boundary description.

(3) AVAILABILITY.—The map and boundary description under paragraph (1) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the Chief of the Forest Service.

### SEC. 3. ACCESS.

Within the Spanish Peaks Wilderness designated under section 2—

(1) the Secretary shall allow the continuation of historic uses of the Bulls Eye Mine Road established prior to the date of enactment of this Act, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may provide; and

(2) access to any privately owned land within the wilderness areas designated under section 2 shall be provided in accordance with section 5 of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1134 et seq.).

### SEC. 4. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

Section 10 of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (Public Law 103-77; 107 Stat. 756; 16 U.S.C. 1132 note) is repealed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) and the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD).

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

(Mr. SHERWOOD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 898, the Spanish Peaks Wilderness Act of 1999, was introduced by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS), my esteemed colleague, and would simply add the Spanish Peaks area to a list of areas designated as wilderness by the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993.

The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) has worked long and hard to protect local interests while trying to preserve an outstanding scenic and geological area. I have hunted and hiked through the Spanish Peaks, and they rise above the high plains majestically all by themselves and are an area certainly worthy of preservation.

This bill passed through subcommittee and full committee on a voice vote, therefore, I would urge my colleagues to support the passage of H.R. 898, the Spanish Peaks Wilderness Act of 1999, under suspension of the rules.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 898 would designate approximately 18,000 acres of land in Colorado, San Isabel National Forest, as wilderness. These lands which contain headwaters in two spectacular 13,000 foot peaks have been studied and considered for wilderness designation for nearly two decades.

This month marks the 35th anniversary of the law that created a national wilderness preservation system. The Wilderness Act has led to the protection of more than 104 million acres of Federal lands. In light of this anniversary, it is most appropriate, Mr. Speaker, that the House is acting on a wilderness bill, an all too infrequent event in recent years I would say.

I do commend the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL), our Democratic colleague, for their sponsorship and hard work on this legislation.

This is a worthy bill, this legislation. It certainly deserves the support of our colleagues, and I ask my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to engage in a colloquy here with the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS).

Mr. Speaker, this bill does differ from last year's Skaggs-McInnis bill in a few respects, and I want to take a few moments to discuss one in particular, namely the exclusion from wilderness of an old road, known as the Bulls Eye Mine Road and the inclusion of language related to that road.

Because some questions have been raised about the scope and effect of that language, contained in subsection 3(1), I think it appropriate to provide a further explanation of how that subsection would or would not affect management of this area.

Accordingly, at the request of the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) I would like to engage the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) in a brief colloquy regarding this part of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, one of the questions that has been raised concerning the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture with regard to regulating the use of the road. During the subcommittee hearing of the bill, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL) asked whether the Secretary would continue to limit those uses to hiking and horseback riding and was assured that the Secretary could do that under the terms of the bill.

Would my colleague agree that, under this bill, the Secretary will continue to have that authority?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS).

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman's inquiry, the answer to that is yes.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, another important question concerns the extent to which the bill might be read as requiring the federal government to repair or maintain the road. This is important, Mr. Speaker, because my colleague will recall that the Forest Service testified that they are in no position to make any commitments to keep the road open, and because its condition is such as to raise serious safety problems and possibly even questions of liability, would the gentleman from Colorado agree that nothing in the bill would have the effect of requiring the United States to undertake any improvements of the road or to maintain any part of the road?

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman from American Samoa, the answer is yes.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, some parties have raised the question about ownership of the road right-of-way itself. Does the gentleman from Colorado agree that nothing in this bill would have the effect of lessening any property before the United States of that land or of limiting the ability of the Secretary to take legal action to assert those interests?

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman repeat the question.

□ 1515

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Does my colleague agree that nothing in this bill would have the effect of lessening any of the property interests of the United States in that land or of limiting the ability of the Secretary to take legal action to assert those interests?

Mr. MCINNIS. The answer to that is yes.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers at this time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS).

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, this is a very exciting day for me and for the people of the State of Colorado that the designation of the Spanish Peaks as a wilderness area is about to pass the House of Representatives. This bill has bipartisan support. This bill does something that we should have done a couple of years ago.

At the very beginning of my comments, I think it is appropriate to give credit to my former colleague, our former colleague, David Skaggs, who retired from Congress 2 years ago, I think. The gentleman put a lot of effort into the Spanish Peaks wilderness. I was privileged to work with David Skaggs for a period of several years on this legislation, and today I hope he is watching so he gets to see this pass.

I have got a lot of personal interest in the Spanish Peaks of Colorado. First a little description of the Spanish Peaks. There are two peaks, the east and west peak. These peaks were often used as guidance for the pioneers who settled in Colorado. When we see them against the Colorado horizon, they stand out against that beautiful blue sky. It really is an asset to the people of this country to have the Spanish Peaks. Now to take that movement to put the Spanish Peaks into a wilderness area is a designation that is well served.

Let me point out an issue that I think is very important. Number one, it is important for all who are watching today and my colleagues on the floor to understand that there are lots of different ways to manage public lands. Wilderness is not the only way to manage public lands. We have lots of tools out there.

For example, we have national parks, we have national forests, we have special areas. There are lots of different ways to manage public lands. The most restrictive and, therefore, the one we should utilize with the most caution is the wilderness designation.

How should we go about naming an area or designating an area as "wilderness"? The first thing that I think fundamentally to the principle of wilderness is that we have got to have local input. We do not have an outside interest come in and dictate to the local people what they ought to do in that local community. We had a lot of local input.

This bill did not start with an outside interest. This bill did not start with some organization outside of the area. This bill started with the local people. I know a lot of those local people.

My great grandparents homesteaded down in that area in La Veta, Colorado, in the 1880s. I know those people down there, and they got together several years ago and they said, the Spanish Peaks at the very top where, by the way, Mr. Speaker, it does not affect water rights, which are absolutely crucial in the State of Colorado, the local people got together and said these are beautiful peaks. Let us manage a small

part of the peaks, about 18,000 acres, as wilderness; and let us do it at the very top where it does not impact water rights, where it limits impact on private property.

I am a strong advocate of private property rights in this country. When this idea first came up, there was some conflict, there was some controversy. So did we look outside of the State of Colorado or even outside that area for advice or dictate on how we ought to resolve that controversy or that conflict? No. We sat down together; we sat down and we talked.

We have had a lot of able leadership through that community to come to a resolution that we are now seeing today about ready to pass the United States House of Representatives.

This bill will mark the Spanish Peaks as a wilderness for many, many, many centuries to come. And long after we are all gone, people will look back and say, the United States Congress, with these conditions and this particular area, made the right decision for wilderness.

A moment to comment about my colleague WAYNE ALLARD. Senator WAYNE ALLARD is also carrying this. He has put a lot of time into this effort. We have got a good team working. We have also had good support from the Colorado delegation. I would be remiss if I did not mention the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY), our senior Member from Colorado Springs; if I did not mention the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER), if I did not mention the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDI), and the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

I should also mention the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) who has spent a good deal of time since he has been elected to Congress to work specifically with me on making sure that the agreements that we have in place are being kept. He has been supportive. I know that that came up a little quicker today than we imagined, so he is not in our presence. He certainly would be here today, but he does support it. And his concerns I think are well protected.

But back to what I think is something all of us can be proud of, and that is, if my colleagues have the opportunity to go to Colorado, my district, the third congressional district is the highest district in the country in elevation and so on. It has got 56 mountains over 14,000 feet, and one of those Spanish Peaks goes over that 14,000. If my colleagues have an opportunity to go to Colorado, take a look at the Spanish Peaks. Understand the history of those mountains and what it means to the people of this country, what it means to the people of Huerfano County, what it means to the people of every county in the State of Colorado.

Today, a great moment for the State of Colorado. It is a great moment for this country. I am proud to be the sponsor of the Spanish Peaks Wilderness area.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado for his eloquence and certainly for in a more specific way allowing Members of our body to understand the specifics of this legislation. I, too, would like to commend his former colleague and our good friend, the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. David Skaggs, for his cosponsorship originally of this legislation with my good friend from Colorado.

Mr. Speaker, since I do not have any additional speakers, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, could we have a time check?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) has 12 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) has yielded back the balance.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS).

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, to my good colleagues on the other side, I would like to make a couple more comments. I do not have any other speakers. My colleague, although he has yielded back his time, if he would like me to yield time, I would be happy to.

Again, now that I know I have got a couple more minutes, let me be a little more exhaustive in my remarks about, number one, David Skaggs.

David came to me several years ago. As my colleagues know, David is a Democrat. I am a Republican. David and I have known each other for a long period of time. We worked together in the Colorado House of Representatives. At the time, I was the majority leader and he was the minority leader.

It was kind of fun to come back here in Congress and to be able to work on something that we completely agreed on and we had our hearts in. I wish David were here today, but I know that David will be at the dedication that we have of the Spanish Peaks down in southern Colorado when we dedicate that portion of the wilderness.

I also want to emphasize and talk for just a couple more minutes about wilderness and what is important about it. There is a philosophy out there or a thought out there that the only way to protect federal lands is to put them in wilderness. As I mentioned, earlier in my remarks, wilderness is the most restrictive and most inflexible management tool we have in our arsenal of tools to manage federal lands. Once we put an area into wilderness, it is in essence locked into that designation forever.

Now, it is true that Congress can overturn a wilderness designation, but for that politically to occur it would be next to impossible.

So before we designate wilderness, I think we, one, need to take our time and make sure that it meets all of the

conditions for wilderness designation; number two, that we try to think into the future and try to come up with what might be the unintended consequences in putting that into wilderness instead of, say, a special area or some type of reserve or a conservation area or national park and so on.

Because the measure is so dramatic, we should manage a wilderness designation just like the former Congressman David Skaggs and myself and the Colorado delegation and my good colleague on the other side of the aisle have done, and that is we sat down and we met with the local community, we took the local input; we let most of the controversy be resolved at the local level; we put together legislation in a very open type of manner. We did not push this as a public relations type of campaign, going out and getting billboards for wilderness and things like that. This has a lot of substance to it. It has got a lot of study and a lot of energy into it. This is the way we ought to name wilderness bills that go through this Congress.

So once again, I thank my colleagues from the Colorado delegation. I thank my good colleague from the other side of the aisle. But more than anything else, I thank the people of America for allowing us to take care of the Spanish Peaks with this designation at the very top.

Every one of my colleagues, this vote they make today will be a vote that generations from now will look back and say, my grandpa and my grandma or my great grandpa or my great grandma voted yes for this.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCINNIS. I yield to the gentleman from American Samoa.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I want to note, for the RECORD, if there is anything as a demonstration of my colleagues in this chamber, I would say that the delegation from Colorado, both Republican and Democrats, probably has displayed the highest example of what bipartisanship should be when it comes to this issue of wilderness legislation.

I want to commend the gentleman for being a part of that ability to give and take. Sometimes we get to be a little too extreme in our views and not be tolerable to the views of another Member, especially on an issue as important as wilderness area. So I commend and thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I too share the comments of the gentleman. We did not try to sneak minimum wage or the Republican tax cut in this bill. This bill was kept clean through the process. It is purely bipartisan, and we can all be very proud when the vote names the Spanish Peaks of Colorado as a wilderness.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, as an original cosponsor of H.R. 898, I rise in support of this important bill to designate the Spanish Peaks as wilderness.

The mountains we call the Spanish Peaks are two volcanic peaks in Las Animas and

Huerfano Counties. Their Native American name is Wayatoya. The eastern peak rises to 12,893 feet above sea level, and the summit of the western peak is at 13,626 feet.

These two peaks were landmarks for Native Americans and for some of Colorado's other early settlers and for travelers along the trail between Bent's Old Fort on the Arkansas River and Taos, New Mexico.

This part of the San Isabel National Forest has outstanding scenic, geologic, and wilderness values, including a spectacular system of more than 250 free-standing dikes and ramps of volcanic materials radiating from the peaks. These lands are striking for their beauty and are also very valuable for wildlife habitat.

Since 1977, the Spanish Peaks have been included on the National Registry of Natural Landmarks, and the State of Colorado has designated them as a natural area. The Forest Service first reviewed them for possible wilderness designation as part of its second roadless area review and evaluation and first recommended them for wilderness in 1979. However, the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1980 instead provided for their continued management as a wilderness study area—a status that was continued on an interim basis by the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993.

In short, Mr. Speaker, the Spanish Peaks are a very special part of Colorado. Their inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System has been too long delayed. In fact, I had hoped that designation of this area as wilderness would be completed last year. The House did pass a Spanish Peaks wilderness bill sponsored by my predecessor, Representative David Skaggs, and Representative MCINNIS after it was favorably reported by the Resources Committee. Unfortunately, the Senate did not act on that measure.

So, I am very appreciative of the persistence shown by Representative MCINNIS as well as the good work of Chairman YOUNG and Subcommittee Chairman CHENOWETH, and the leadership of Representative MILLER of California and the gentleman from Washington, Mr. SMITH. As a new Member of the Committee, I am very glad to have been able to work with them to bring us to where we are today with this bill.

This bill does differ from last year's Skaggs-McInnis bill in a few respects, and in particular by the exclusion from wilderness of an old road, known as the Bulls Eye Mine Road, and the inclusion of language related to that road.

Because some questions have been raised about the scope and effect of that language, contained in subsection 3(1), I thought it was important to provide a further explanation of how that subsection would or would not affect management of this area. Accordingly, I greatly appreciate the assistance of the gentleman from American Samoa in engaging my colleague from Colorado, Mr. MCINNIS, in a brief colloquy regarding that part of the bill. This colloquy is an important part of the legislative history of this bill.

As was mentioned earlier during debate on this bill, its passage is an appropriate step in recognition of the recent 35th anniversary of the enactment of the Wilderness Act. As a strong supporter of protecting wilderness—and particularly of protecting our wilderness areas in Colorado—I hope that this is only the first of several Colorado wilderness bills that will come before the House in the months ahead.

Already, the Resources Committee has approved a bill that, among other things, would

designate additional wilderness in the area of the Black Canyon of the Gunnison. And currently pending before the Committee are two wilderness bills I have introduced, dealing with the James Peak area and with lands within Rocky Mountain National Park, as well as a very important bill by our colleague Ms. DEGETTE that breaks important new ground in terms of protecting wilderness areas on public lands in Colorado managed by the Bureau of Land Management. In my opinion, all these measures deserve priority consideration in our Committee and here on the floor of the House.

Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, I again thank both the gentleman from American Samoa and my colleague, Mr. MCINNIS, for their cooperation, and am glad to join in support of the Spanish Peaks Wilderness Act.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have no more requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 898.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### QUINEBAUG AND SHETUCKET RIVERS VALLEY NATIONAL HERITAGE CORRIDOR REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1999

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1619) to amend the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor Act of 1994 to expand the boundaries of the Corridor, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1619

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; REFERENCE.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor Reauthorization Act of 1999”.

(b) **REFERENCE.**—Whenever in this Act a section or other provision is amended or repealed, such amendment or repeal shall be considered to be made to that section or other provision of the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor Act of 1994 (Public Law 103-449; 16 U.S.C. 461 note).

#### SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Section 102 of the Act is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting “and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts” after “State of Connecticut”;

(2) by striking paragraph (2) and redesignating paragraphs (3) through (9) as paragraphs (2) through (8), respectively; and

(3) in paragraph (3) (as so redesignated), by inserting “New Haven,” after “Hartford.”

#### SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT OF QUINEBAUG AND SHETUCKET RIVERS VALLEY NATIONAL HERITAGE CORRIDOR; PURPOSE.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—Section 103(a) of the Act is amended by inserting “and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts” after “State of Connecticut”.

(b) **PURPOSE.**—Section 103(b) of the Act is amended to read as follows:

“(b) **PURPOSE.**—It is the purpose of this title to provide assistance to the State of Connecticut and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, their units of local and regional government and citizens in the development and implementation of integrated natural, cultural, historic, scenic, recreational, land, and other resource management programs in order to retain, enhance, and interpret the significant features of the lands, water, structures, and history of the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley.”.

#### SEC. 4. BOUNDARIES AND ADMINISTRATION.

(a) **BOUNDARIES.**—Section 104(a) of the Act is amended—

(1) by inserting “Union,” after “Thompson,”; and

(2) by inserting after “Woodstock” the following: “in the State of Connecticut, and the towns of Brimfield, Charlton, Dudley, E. Brookfield, Holland, Oxford, Southbridge, Sturbridge, and Webster in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, which are contiguous areas in the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley, related by shared natural, cultural, historic, and scenic resources”.

(b) **ADMINISTRATION.**—Section 104 of the Act is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(b) **ADMINISTRATION.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—(A) The Corridor shall be managed by the management entity in accordance with the management plan, in consultation with the Governor and pursuant to a compact with the Secretary.

“(B) The management entity shall amend its by-laws to add the Governor of Connecticut (or the Governor’s designee) and the Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts (or the Governor’s designee) as a voting members of its Board of Directors.

“(C) The management entity shall provide the Governor with an annual report of its activities, programs, and projects. An annual report prepared for any other purpose shall satisfy the requirements of this paragraph.

“(2) **COMPACT.**—To carry out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary shall enter into a compact with the management entity. The compact shall include information relating to the objectives and management of the Corridor, including, but not limited to, each of the following:

“(A) A delineation of the boundaries of the Corridor.

“(B) A discussion of goals and objectives of the Corridor, including an explanation of the proposed approaches to accomplishing the goals set forth in the management plan.

“(C) A description of the role of the State of Connecticut and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

“(3) **AUTHORITIES OF MANAGEMENT ENTITY.**—For the purpose of achieving the goals set forth in the management plan, the management entity may use Federal funds provided under this Act—

“(A) to make grants to the State of Connecticut and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, their political subdivisions, nonprofit organizations, and other persons;

“(B) to enter into cooperative agreements with or provide technical assistance to the State of Connecticut and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, their political subdivisions, nonprofit organizations, and other persons;

“(C) to hire and compensate staff; and

“(D) to contract for goods and services.

“(4) **PROHIBITION ON ACQUISITION OF REAL PROPERTY.**—The management entity may not use Federal funds received under this Act to acquire real property or any interest in real property.”.

#### SEC. 5. STATES CORRIDOR PLAN.

Section 105 of the Act is amended—

(1) by striking subsections (a) and (b);

(2) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (a);

(3) in subsection (a) (as so redesignated)—

(A) by striking the first sentence and all that follows through “Governor,” and inserting the

following: “The management entity shall implement the management plan. Upon request of the management entity.”; and

(B) in paragraph (5), by striking “identified pursuant to the inventory required by section 5(a)(1)”;

and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) **GRANTS AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.**—For the purposes of implementing the management plan, the management entity may make grants or provide technical assistance to the State of Connecticut and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, their political subdivisions, nonprofit organizations, and other persons to further the goals set forth in the management plan.”.

#### SEC. 6. DUTIES OF THE SECRETARY.

Section 106 of the Act is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “Governor” each place it appears and inserting “management entity”;

(B) by striking “preparation and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following: “Such assistance shall include providing funds authorized under section 109 and technical assistance necessary to carry out this Act.”; and

(2) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

“(b) **TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.**—The Secretary may not make any grants or provide any assistance under this Act after September 30, 2009.”.

#### SEC. 7. DUTIES OF OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES.

Section 107 of the Act is amended by striking “Governor” and inserting “management entity”.

#### SEC. 8. DEFINITIONS.

Section 108 of the Act is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting before the period the following: “and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts”;

(2) in paragraph (3), by inserting before the period the following: “and the Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts”;

(3) in paragraph (5), by striking “each of” and all that follows and inserting the following: “the Northeastern Connecticut Council of Governments, the Windham Regional Council of Governments, and the Southeastern Connecticut Council of Governments in Connecticut, (or their successors), and the Pioneer Valley Regional Planning Commission and the Southern Worcester County Regional Planning Commission (or their successors) in Massachusetts.”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(6) The term ‘management plan’ means the document approved by the Governor of the State of Connecticut on February 16, 1999, and adopted by the management entity, entitled ‘Vision to Reality: A Management Plan’, the management plan for the Corridor, as it may be amended or replaced from time to time.

“(7) The term ‘management entity’ means Quinebaug-Shetucket Heritage Corridor, Inc., a not-for-profit corporation (or its successor) incorporated in the State of Connecticut.”.

#### SEC. 9. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 109 of the Act is amended to read as follows:

#### “SEC. 109. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—There is authorized to be appropriated under this title not more than \$1,000,000 for any fiscal year. Not more than a total of \$10,000,000 may be appropriated for the Corridor under this title after the date of the enactment of the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor Reauthorization Act of 1999.

“(b) **50 PERCENT MATCH.**—Federal funding provided under this title may not exceed 50 percent of the total cost of any assistance or grant provided or authorized under this title.”.

#### SEC. 10. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) **LONG TITLE.**—The long title of the Act is amended to read as follows: “An Act to establish the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley